

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner A. Roman is thanked for a complete search and thorough Office Action.

3. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 21 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheek et al., U. S. Patent 6,018,180, is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The argument in Response dated January 9, 2003 to a previous Office Action is still applicable. In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 21 and 23-25 over Cheek et al., the following describes in more detail and with cited references both the applicant's application and Cheek's patent and the differences between the two inventions.

The applicant's claim 21 has been twice amended to distinguish the applicant's shallow diffused junction (shallower than the source/drain junction) from Cheek's structure in which the diffused region 380 is significantly below the source/drain region 320 (Fig. 14). This distinction should place the applicant's claim 21 in allowance.

The Examiner states on page 5, paragraph 3 in Office Action dated 05/02/03 that "--the low energy implants and concentration suggested by Cheek fall within the same ranges of energy implants and concentration suggest by Applicants

6. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheek et al. is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claim 22 is a dependent claim that does not stand on its own merits but supports the independent claim 21.

It is requested that Examiner A. Roman call the undersigned Attorney at (845) 452-5863 should there be anything that can be done to help bring this Patent Application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

*George D. Saile*

George D. Saile

Reg. No. 19,512



Creation date: 15-08-2003  
Indexing Officer: LCHAU - LINH CHAU  
Team: OIPEScanning  
Dossier: 09855844

Legal Date: 12-08-2003

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	A...	1
2	CLM	4
3	REM	3

Total number of pages: 8

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on .....